

## REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 15-16, 21 and 23 without prejudice. Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 are pending. Claims 1, 11-14, 20 and 22 are amended herein.

No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 13, lines 11-19, of the instant application.

### 102 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sawin et al. ("Sawin;" U.S. Patent No. 5,450,205). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1-2 and 7 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sawin.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Sawin does not show or suggest "a signal value corresponding to said second wavelength is determined for a first region using signal values from a subset of said second regions neighboring said first region" as recited in independent Claim 1. Sawin appears only to teach a conventional color CCD array 342, as opposed to the type of imager that is described and used in the manner recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Sawin does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, because Claims 2 and 7 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that Sawin does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 2 and 7.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed, and that Claims 1-2 and 7 are in condition for allowance.

### 103 Rejections

#### Claims 3 and 9

The instant Office Action states that Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawin. The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 3 and 9 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sawin.

As presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sawin does not show or suggest "a signal value corresponding to said second wavelength is determined for a first region using signal values from a subset of said second regions neighboring said first region" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Because Claims 3 and 9 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that Sawin also does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 3 and 9.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claims 3 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley et al. ("Crowley;" U.S. Patent No. 6,847,454) in view of Sawin. The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Crowley and Sawin, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Crowley does not show or suggest "a signal value corresponding to said second wavelength is determined for a first region using signal values from a subset of said second regions neighboring said first region" as recited in independent Claim 1, "signal values from a subset of said second elements neighboring a first element are averaged to determine a signal value corresponding to said second wavelength for said first element" as recited in independent Claim 11, nor "determining a signal value for said second wavelength for a first region using signal values from a subset of said second regions neighboring said first region" as recited in independent Claim 20. Crowley appears only to teach multi-element photo detectors 224 and 226, but not the types of imagers described and used in the manner recited in Claims 1, 11 and 20.

Applicant also respectfully asserts that Sawin does not overcome the shortcomings of Crowley. As mentioned above, Sawin appears only to teach a conventional color CCD array 342, as opposed to the types of imagers described and used in the manner recited in Claims 1, 11 and 20.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Crowley nor Sawin nor the combination thereof shows or suggests the limitations of independent Claims 1,

11 and 20 cited above. Because Claims 2-10, 12-14, 17-19, 22 and 24-25 depend from Claim 1, 11 or 20 and recite additional limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that Crowley and Sawin, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 2-10, 12-14, 17-19, 22 and 24-25.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 are in condition for allowance.

#### Claims 16 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley and Sawin and further in view of Yang et al. ("Yang;" U.S. Patent No. 6,611,339). Claims 16 and 23 are canceled herein and so a discussion of the rejection of these claims is rendered moot at this time. Nevertheless, the Applicant has reviewed the Yang reference and respectfully submits that, for the reasons previously presented herein, the embodiments of the present invention recited in the remaining Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Crowley, Sawin and Yang, alone or in combination.

#### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.


Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-14, 17-20, 22 and 24-25 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Date: 6/16/06

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060